

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SHAWN GRANBERRY,

No. C-04-0845 JSW (EMC)

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER RE JOINT LETTER OF JULY
21, 2005
(Docket No. 42)**

JET BLUE AIRWAYS,

Defendant.

For the Northern District of California

On July 26, 2005, the Court held a conference call with the parties regarding the discovery disputes raised in their joint letter of July 21, 2005. This order memorializes the Court's oral rulings.

A. Depositions

Plaintiff shall be permitted to complete the deposition of Michelle Steiner, with Plaintiff being limited to the time remaining (which was estimated to be approximately an hour). The deposition shall take place in the Bay Area.

The deposition of Andrew Schweibert shall also take place in the Bay Area, with Plaintiff paying for the reasonable cost of travel for Mr. Schweibert (*e.g.*, airfare, cab, parking). The parties should make their best efforts to coordinate the depositions of Ms. Steiner and Mr. Schweibert so that they take place on or about the same day or on consecutive days.

As for the deposition of Kevin Hoover, if Mr. Hoover voluntarily agrees to be deposed in the Bay Area, then Plaintiff shall pay for the reasonable cost of his travel, and the parties should make their best efforts to coordinate his deposition on or about the same time as the depositions of Ms. Steiner and Mr. Schweibert. However, if Mr. Hoover does not agree, then Plaintiff will have to issue

1 a subpoena pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45. Defendant shall make a reasonable
2 effort to find out Mr. Hoover's current contact information (both telephone number and address) and
3 provide that information to Plaintiff on a timely basis.

4 B. Jet Blue's Production of E-Mails and Reports on Computer Tapes

5 Jet Blue shall produce responsive documents by August 1, 2005. The parties should meet
6 and confer to determine whether any additional depositions should be taken in light of any
7 responsive documents produced.

8 C. Ramp Irregularity Report re Patrick Trainer

9 The parties have reached agreement on this issue.

10 D. Jet Blue's Document Requests and Requests for Supplementary Interrogatory Responses

11 This dispute has largely been resolved because Plaintiff recently provided responses to
12 Defendant. Defendant is not precluded from timely filing a discovery motion to challenge the
13 adequacy or propriety of the responses.

14 This order disposes of Docket No. 42.

15
16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17
18 Dated: July 26, 2005



EDWARD M. CHEN
United States Magistrate Judge